

## **QUESTIONS POSED AT 3<sup>RD</sup> PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION / CAG MEETING**

**18 APRIL 2012**

### Pre-Session Topics of Concern / Questions:

PRPs – What is being done to get non-LWG parties involved in the cleanup of the site?

COCs – Is EPA making sure that all of the contamination at the site will be addressed?

FS Report – Does one really have to read all 8000 pages to get an understanding of the potential remedies for the site?

### Questions Posed During Session:

When EPA completes an exposure assessment, do you take into account that people may have increased activity (ie., exposures) as the river is being cleaned and deemed safer?

Was an ecological risk assessment completed?

What are the potential risks for the higher-level species (eg., mink)?

What is the outcome (eg., death) of the potential risks to higher-level species?

How often is the site-specific status information tied to the uplands site map at the DEQ website updated?

How many of the uplands sites currently have agreements in place with DEQ to evaluate source control needs?

Are the site-specific priority levels provided on the uplands site map at the DEQ website up to date?

How many upland sites still have problems that can impact the river?

Do the companies located along the river remove tires that were put in place to control erosion from their sites?

What impacts to the river can be caused by the old tires noted above?

Can you explain the various components/processes involved in MNR?

How often is the navigation channel dredged?

Where was the maintenance dredging performed?

What was done with the dredged materials from the maintenance dredging?

How are the data for the various projects (ie., uplands and FS work) acquired and by whom to assure that the data are comparable?

What are the differences in data collected for the DEQ and LWG work?

How do you determine a sitewide concentration for a COC?

Does the determination of a sitewide concentration include the navigation channel?

Who would be involved with the oversight of dredging work if it goes on for 30 years USACOE?

Would the USACOE do some of the dredging work for the site cleanup?

Statement made that most of the PRPs are currently in negotiations to determine the allocation of remedy costs at the site.

Does EPA expect that the allocation negotiations will be completed to meet their schedules for remedial actions?

What dredging methods are considered in the FS?

Why does it take so much longer to clean up to the lower RALs?

Where did the three dredging projects per year assumption come from?

Why wouldn't all of the "r" alternatives score higher than "i" alternatives because more dredging should have greater longterm effectiveness?

If the COCs are capped, wouldn't there still be a risk for release of COCs over the long term?

Did EPA suggest the numerical model that was used and has said model been applied at other Superfund sites?

What is the projected average sitewide PCB concentration after 45 years for Alternative A?

Why is sitewide average a level appropriate for consideration in determining the amount of materials for cleanup?

Could EPA select different alternatives for different areas within the river?

Is the river currently clean enough for people to swim in it?